



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/680,522	10/07/2003	Ravi Kuchibhotla	CS23738RL	5055
20280	7590	06/19/2006	EXAMINER	
MOTOROLA INC 600 NORTH US HIGHWAY 45 ROOM AS437 LIBERTYVILLE, IL 60048-5343				APPIAH, CHARLES NANA
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2617		

DATE MAILED: 06/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/680,522	KUCHIBHOTLA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Charles N. Appiah	2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/21/05 & 3/23/06.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 1-13 and 18-24 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 14-17, 26-28, 30, 32, 33 and 35-38 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 29 and 31 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicants' arguments with regard to the restriction requirement for claims 19-24 have been found persuasive. The restriction requirement is hereby withdrawn and claims 19-24 are being examined on the merits.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on December 21, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With regard to applicants' argument that because "Mildh, in para. [0015], the selection is based on registration information in the HLR.....", "... there is no reason, for Mildh to provide system information including ..." claim 14 is patentably distinguished over Mildh", examiner respectfully disagrees and maintains that Mildh as used in the rejection of claim 14 clearly meets the limitations of the claim, specially paragraph [0009] teaches the steps of furnishing the mobile station with parameter information pertaining to mode of operation, which meets "receiving system information" and paragraph [0016] showing "the network broadcasting a value in the SI and/or PSI telling the mobile station which core network it should camp on ..."meets the pointer information indicating

With regard to Applicant's argument that "in Mildh, the mode of operation determines to which access network the mobile station connects, and as such claim 15 is thus patentably distinguished over Mildh", examiner respectfully disagrees and asserts that Mildh meets the limitations of claim 15, as set forth in the rejection.

With regard to Applicants' argument that Mildh fails to disclose or suggest ... "obtaining an identity for the core network to which the communication device attempts to connect using the pointer information", examiner asserts that the broadcasted value in the SI and or PSI telling the mobile station which core network it should camp on as further exemplified the SI/PSI, in paragraph [0016] clearly meets "obtaining an identity for the core network to which the communication device attempts to connect using the pointer information" the pointer information being inherently provided in the SI/PSI.

The above response apply equally to Applicants' arguments pertaining to claims 17, 25 34 and 36.

In view of the above the rejections using Mildh are maintained as repeated below. These actions are made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 14-17, 26, 34, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mildh et al. (US 2002/0193139).

Regarding claim 14, Mildh discloses a method in a communication device, the method comprising: receiving system information, the system information including pointer information indicating where the communication device may obtain information about multiple core networks sharing a common access network from which the system information was received (mobile being furnished with parameter information pertaining

to mode of operation, see page 1, [0009-0010], page 2, [0014-0017] and page 3, [0029-0032]), attempting to connect to a core network based on the information about multiple core networks sharing the common access network from which the system information was received (mobile making a selection of a cell after decoding information from a specific system information message or a parameter in the existing PSI/SI message, see page 2, [0018-0019]).

Regarding claim 15, Mildh further discloses selecting the one of the multiple core networks to which the communication device attempts to connect using the information about multiple core networks sharing the common access network from which the system information message was received (see page 2, [0018]).

Regarding claim 16, Mildh further discloses obtaining an identity for the core network to which the communication device attempts to connect using the pointer information (see page 2, [0016]).

Regarding claim 17, Mildh further discloses the system information including a common identity for the multiple core networks sharing the common access network (see page 2, [0016]), attempting to connect to one of the multiple networks sharing the common access network from which the system information was received upon satisfaction of a condition (see page [0016]), attempting to connect to a core network using the common identity when the condition is not satisfied (mobile station resorting to a default solution that can be specified in a network standard, page 2, [0017]).

Regarding claim 25, Mildh discloses a method in a communication device, the method comprising: receiving first system information from a first access network

(GERAN) and receiving second system information from a second access network (UTRAN), the first system information including a first core network identity and information on how many core networks share the first access network (see page 1, [0009-0010], page 2, 0014-0015]), the second system information including a second core network identity (see page 2, [0016]), selecting one of the first and second core network identities based on the number of core networks sharing the first access network.

Regarding claim 26, Mildh further discloses receiving the information in response to an unsuccessful core network connection attempt

Regarding claims 34 and 36, Mildh discloses a method in a communication network entity, the method comprising: receiving preferred core network information from a communication device (feature of a preference for one of the interfaces set in the mobile station, see page 3, [0035]), selecting a core network for the communication device by giving consideration to the preferred core network information received from the communication device when selecting the core network for the communication device (subscriber using IP multimedia services always selecting the 3G core network, see page 3, [0035-0039]).

Regarding claim 35, Mildh further discloses receiving the at least one preferred core network from a communication device in a connection request (feature of a subscriber using IP multimedia services always selecting the 3G core network in an inherent connection request, see page 3, [0035]).

4. Claims 27, 28, 30 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rajaniemi et al. (6,792,277).

Regarding claims 27, 30 and 33 Rajaniemi discloses a wireless communications system information message modulated on a radio frequency carrier, the communications system information message comprising: an information block, the information block including a data field for a number indicating how many core networks share a common (feature of location area identifiers of the location areas of all core networks whereto the cell at issue belongs and as monitored by the mobile station, col. 6, lines 1-5, col. 6, line 58 to col. 7, line 3).

Regarding claim 28, Rajaniemi discloses the information block is a core network-identifying portion of the system information message (see col. 6, lines 58-60).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
6. Claims 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mildh et al as applied to claim 36 above, and further in view of Well-Known Prior Art (Official Notice)

Regarding claims 37 and 38, Mildh further discloses core network (CN) selection based on user identity, mobile capability and location in mixed networks (see page 1, [0010], and inherently receiving a connection request from the communication device (feature of a subscriber using IP multimedia services always in selecting the 3G

core network in an inherent connection request, see page 3, [0035]), but fails to explicitly teach receiving the communication device identity from the communication device in response to the network entity requesting the communication device identity or requesting the communication device identity in response to receiving the connection request from the communication device.

However, the concept of authentication in wireless communication networks is very well known and expected in the art and as such examiner takes Official Notice that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide for an authentication procedure whereby the network requests a subscriber's identity which must be provided by the subscriber in order to ensure that communication services are provided to legitimate subscribers who request access to communication services and based on what is subscribed to thus prevent fraudulent use of communication resources and services.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 1-13 and 18-24 are allowed.
5. Claims 29 and 31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Korpela (6,801,786) discloses a communication system in which

a plurality of core networks, possibly incompatible with each other, can be connected to an access network.

Park et al. (6,950,419) discloses a method for using system information message to select a core network.

Kauranen et al. (US 2004/0162077) discloses a mechanism for performing routing in a communication system having a plurality of core networks.

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles N. Appiah whose telephone number is 571 272-7904. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM-5:00PM.

Art Unit: 2617

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold can be reached on 571 272-7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CA



CHARLES APPIAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER